

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 277

SP 037 381

AUTHOR Loving, Cathleen C.; Graham, Diane
TITLE Progressive Indicators of Student Teacher Development: A Local Generative Model Compared to Established State Proficiencies.
PUB DATE Apr 97
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Outcomes Assessment; Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Models; Preservice Teacher Education; State Standards; Student Evaluation; Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Competencies; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Performance Indicators; *Texas A and M University

ABSTRACT

This study at Texas A&M University identified indicators of student teacher development to guide their supervising cooperating teachers. Meetings were held with cooperating teachers to brainstorm indicators of success in student teaching. The questions raised addressed: what cooperating teachers should look for in preservice teaching; what progression should be expected in preservice teaching performance; what hierarchy existed for these indicators; and possible categorization of the indicators. A list of 64 indicators was generated, followed by open coding of each indicator and subsequent categorization. A draft document was presented at several professional development meetings of university supervisors for comments and refinement. The indicators were matched and coded against the five learner-centered proficiencies expected of Texas teachers. The resulting document was made available for use by university supervisors. It also became part of the Appendix of the Student Teaching Handbook. The result combines the research- and outcomes-based standards of the State of Texas with the learner-centered proficiencies from the teacher-generated indicators. Appended are: the Texas State Proficiencies, Suggested Indicators of Student Teacher Progressive Development, the Student Teacher Progressive Development Initial Stage Observation Checklist, and Progressive Development Growth & Development Stage Observation Checklist." (Contains 15 references.) (JLS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 409 277

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Loving

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**Progressive Indicators of Student Teacher Development:
A Local Generative Model Compared to
Established State Proficiencies**

presented by

Cathleen C. Loving, Texas A&M University

Diane Graham, Texas A&M University

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting--March 28, 1997--Chicago, IL

5637381

**Progressive Indicators of Student Teacher Development:
A Local Generative Model Compared to
Established State Proficiencies**

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to report results of research which led to the development of a theoretical framework which may be uniquely suited to novice student teachers or interns and which assists mentors in decoding the complex art and science of teaching in order to make best use of a (rather typical) one-semester apprenticeship--student teaching.

The first objective is to describe the research leading to a locally generated document, "Progressive Indicators of Student Teacher Development," now used by cooperating teachers and university supervisors at one large university in the supervision and mentoring of semester-long student teachers. The second objective is to present research which compares these locally generated progressive indicators of student teacher development with the newly established Proficiencies for Teachers in the State of Texas (Texas Education Agency, 1995). The third objective is to present findings as to how the progressive indicators, keyed to the State proficiencies, are being used to improve mentoring and supervision of student teachers at this university.

Perspectives

While there is much research supporting field experiences, especially student teaching, as the most powerful in a preservice teacher's program (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990), it is also evident that field-based courses, including student teaching, can have a negative effect on goals for students to become reflective and to critically appraise their teaching (Berliner, 1985, Lanier & Little, 1986). In some cases students feel more confident about teaching after student teaching, but this self-perception may

conflict with other indicators (Metcalf, 1991). If one is looking for changes in teacher behavior, or competence, attitudes, or ability to think critically about the profession, this sometimes diminishes after student teaching experiences (Evertson, Hawley, & Zlotnik, 1985). There also may be more negative attitudes about colleagues, learners, and teaching in general (Metcalf, 1991).

Recent research (Winograd, Higgins, McEwan & Haddon, 1995) has shown that when experienced mentor teachers familiar with a university's program and goals had student teacher supervision turned over to them--but without additional formal training----the mentoring became too technical or practical. Researchers commented that this might be appropriate for interns/student teachers in their initial or "emergent" stage of development, but not as they progressed. By altering a rubric designed to grade interns, these mentor teachers are now moving away from just lesson elements and classroom management to a slightly more critical stance toward their teaching.

Likewise, the effect of university supervisors on student teachers can be negative. Lipton and Lesser (1978) found that university supervisors sometimes got in the way of the relationship between the student teacher and cooperating teacher. Richardson-Koehler (1988) noted that university supervisors seem free to discuss lesson design components, but if they begin to discuss routines or classroom structures, they can in fact conflict with the territory of the classroom teacher. Sometimes university supervisors feel ineffective in their work, or their interns/student teachers perceive them as uninformed about the realities of the classroom (Winograd, Higgins, McEwan & Haddon, 1995). Sometimes university supervisors are perceived as not understanding the whole classroom context that impinges on the student teacher's performance (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990).

The research does, however, seem to show that when the field-based experiences include greater organizational clarity, training, supervision and support of the cooperating teacher; and regular detailed supervision and feedback from the university supervisor, the results are substantially and significantly improved (Metcalf, 1991). Our

effort in this study was to develop a document that would help clarify the complex task of moving from student to teacher, by developing indicators that would emphasize the developmental nature of teaching. This could, we hoped, aid in the mentoring skills and communication between university supervisors and mentor teachers--all to aid the student teacher.

Background of Reform in Texas

Since part of this research involves linking our field-generated indicators for student teacher progress with state proficiencies for teachers, a bit of history is in order. The Texas Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education (CSOTE) was charged by the Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) to come up with outcomes-based standards for teachers. They did so in a draft document in 1992 (CSOTE, 1992). Twelve different outcomes were detailed in fifteen pages. [The outcomes were derived from reports of CCSSO, NASDTEC, SCANS, as well as models from Alverno College, Clayton State College, the Texas ATE Task Force and the Kentucky Department of Education guide for preparation and certification.]

Then in 1993, 10,000 Texas educators were surveyed to determine the teacher proficiencies most important for the 21st Century. The list given to the educators was based on the above outcomes and was then rated by the educators. Over 95% of the original outcomes listed were rated either "of great importance" or "very great importance." This helped further clarify and simplify outcomes. After focus groups met, a pared down, 1000-word document based on learner-centered schools was adopted in February, 1994 and was then extended to learner-centered proficiencies for administrators and counselors in the October, 1995 version. It should be emphasized that these proficiencies do more than pay lip service to progressive rhetoric. They do, if taken literally, require a transformation in the way teachers are educated and appraised, demanding constructivist approaches to teaching and learning, equity for all, and a new level of life-long commitment to praxis. These proficiencies provide the basis for the development of a new teacher

appraisal system and teacher education programs at state universities and colleges. As of January, 1997 the original five learner-centered proficiencies have been broadened to eight domains for teacher appraisal (TEA, 1997). These eight domains, however, are based on the original five learner-centered proficiencies.

Background of Student Teaching at Texas A&M University

Texas A&M, like so many other universities with teacher education programs, is going through many changes. Currently seeking to keep its 1992 NCATE accreditation status, our elementary and secondary programs are becoming heavily field-based with great attention being paid to the nature of the course work, the nature of those field experiences and the nature of the teacher product we are providing to the state of Texas. One of the authors just stepped down as Director of Field Experiences after four and a half years, the other is a veteran supervisor, newly hired as Assistant Director of Field Experiences. Over the last ten years, our teacher education program has been associated with Project 30, the Holmes group, John Goodlad's Center, the Danforth Leadership Effort and the National Education Association's Teacher Education Initiative among others. One of the results of these liaisons is not only a reformulated notion of how teachers should be educated, but the founding and sustaining of two elementary, one middle and one secondary professional development school--with plans for substantial expansion in both areas over the next five years.

Despite these changes, only a small portion of our students end up in professional development schools for student teaching (@60 out of nearly 700). The majority of our student teachers each year either stay locally or move to major cities and suburbs for a semester of student teaching. While more and more of them have had field-based methods courses, the reality is that their most intensive, sustained experience working in schools is still the student teaching semester. While there are a variety of supervisory-mentoring models at work in our professional development schools (paid internships, clinical supervisors on campus, student teachers assigned to a team, peer

coaching, grand rounds where students travel to classrooms like medical students), once again, the bulk of the student teaching supervision is carried out by carefully chosen cooperating teachers who are oriented by an assigned university supervisor (who her/himself visits @ 7 times during the semester). Both new university supervisors and new cooperating teachers are provided with (separate) initial orientation meetings. In addition, university supervisors meet two additional times each semester for professional development. We also provide a once-a-semester cooperating teacher retreat near the end, both as a reward and to provide mentoring and supervision speakers and sessions. These have been extremely successful. Our greatest challenge regarding cooperating teachers continues to be finding ways to assist them in developing their mentoring and supervisory skills.

Methods

The method used to arrive at the current version of "Progressive Indicators..." was based on grounded-theory research (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). What started as interest in finding ways to assist cooperating teachers who were new to mentoring or who were sometimes overwhelmed with the responsibility of advising someone who was new to so many aspects of teaching, began to take form with a series of meetings with cooperating teachers. One university supervisor led the effort by brainstorming with various groups of elementary and middle school cooperating teachers with whom she was working as mentors of student teachers. Over the project, at least 25 or 30 teachers were involved. The informal discussions turned more formal as the group of teachers began to meet regularly over a three- or four-month period. In the process, they generated a long list of the things they thought indicated student teacher progress during the semester. What guided the development of the list and the subsequent open coding and categorization were some key questions:

How do we deconstruct the complex notion of teaching for novices so that we can answer the following questions?

- 1) What do I need to look for first (first week, second week?) as a mentor-supervisor; where can I expect them to be in their development in a number of critical areas?
- 2) Is there any kind of progression of indicators of success for novice teachers?
- 3) Is there some sort of chronology or hierarchy to these indicators?
- 4) Can we categorize these indicators and get a big picture of progressive development?

As teachers from the field began to brainstorm indicators of success they thought important, it was important to conceptualize and not just describe indicators (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). For example, there was quite a philosophical argument about what several teachers meant by "raises and lowers students' level of concern." Was this a ploy to raise stress? worry? Was it in reference to increasing the involvement and engagement of the student so they would go beyond just wanting information and awareness but wanted to be more systematically involved with the material? It turns out that with this particular group it meant that when students were getting off task from their work or not seeming to value something that in fact was critical in the lesson, the student teacher was able to use phrases that would clearly signal why and how this was something worthy of their attention and effort.

In the end, a list of 64 indicators was generated. This was followed by open coding of each indicator and subsequent categorization. In this process naming and dimensionalizing the categories was a top priority. Using Strauss and Corbin's (1990) notion of the "flip-flop" technique also helped. This had teachers visualizing what the opposite from successful indicators would be like. An example would be instead of the indicator "knows students' names and classroom routines" we would have "knows no student names nor any of the classroom routines." This kind of exercise for many of the indicators helped when it came time to decide which indicators might take different positions in terms of the chronology of the semester. Clearly the example with names and routines seems essential very early in the semester.

The next step after open coding, called axial coding--making connections between categories by looking at the particular conditions of student teaching-- came rather naturally (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Here the issues of what causal events might lead to successful student teaching, what set of conditions are necessary where action/interaction can occur, what structural conditions bear on action/interaction, what strategies help with managing and carrying out student teaching and, finally, what are the consequences or outcomes were natural for us to ask from the beginning of the query?

The document was then presented at several professional development meetings of university supervisors over a year-long period for their comments, refinement and additions. If we were to move towards a grounded theory of indicators for student teacher development, we would have to go beyond the work of one group of cooperating teachers and look for fit, understanding, generality and control (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) from others involved in the process. In this case, we turned to the team of university supervisors, who typically number from 25-35.

The next step involved the Director of Field Experiences coding and categorizing each indicator by comparison to the five, learner-centered proficiencies of Texas teachers, established by extensive research and adopted by the legislature (TEA, 1995). Since the document was reduced from an earlier, longer version, each description is a powerful essence of what teachers must do to assure learner-centered knowledge, instruction, equity in excellence, communication, and professional development (See Appendix A).

The indicators--now matched and coded with Texas proficiencies--were again presented to all supervisors and cooperating teachers who had been previously involved for discussion, modification and finally validation. The document was made available to university supervisors who could use it in any way they wanted. The only stipulation agreed upon by all was that it was not intended as an observation instrument for

any given point in time. It was to be a helpful tool to indicate progress to date towards desirable levels of proficiency for a student teacher.

In the fall of 1996, the Progressive Indicators became part of the Appendix of the Student Teaching Handbook, so that all supervisors and cooperating teachers would be able to use them. Over the past four semesters, we have collected from supervisors a list of the various ways the indicators are being successfully used. This is discussed below.

Results

The "Progressive Indicators" document (See Appendix B) describes three chronological stages for student teachers to move through during the semester: Initial Stage, Growth and Development Stage, and Refinement Stage. The indicators themselves throughout these three stages fall into three categories dealing with Professionalism, Instruction, and Management. Within these stages and categories, each indicator has listed along side it one to five of the Texas proficiencies, depending on how comprehensive or powerful is a particular indicator. What is most interesting are two things:

First, all who evaluated the document dimensionalized the categories of Professionalism, Instruction and Management as they seemed to necessarily fall into a different order of prominence, depending on whether the student was in the Initial, Growth and Development, or Refinement stage. As it turns out Professionalism, Instruction and then Management were the order at first--where it appears the most important thing a student teacher could do was show all the early signs of professionalism, while carefully assessing the best instructional and management strategies for the particular situation.

In the second stage, Growth and Development, Management indicators were numerous and more prominent, each being keyed to three Texas proficiencies. Instructional proficiencies were more numerous, with some keyed to one, others to four Texas proficiencies. While the Professionalism indicators were considerably fewer in the Growth and Development stage, they were critical in the sense that each was keyed to two or three Texas proficiencies. They also require increasing levels of reflection (from more

basic indicators in the initial stage like knowing the Handbook). When students moved into the Refinement stage, the primary indicators were Instructional, followed by Professionalism and Management (which was considered at somewhat of a steady state).

The second particularly interesting thing about looking at the indicators in terms of the Texas proficiencies is that as one moves through the stages, more and more of the indicators appear to apply to three, four and even five of the proficiencies. All seemed to agree that the indicators which were matched to three or more of the proficiencies stood out as powerful indicators to effective teaching. One example was "soliciting student input for developing lesson objectives."

University supervisors and cooperating teachers are now using the Progressive Indicators in a number of effective ways at various times during the semester. They were placed in a convenient matrix so that students could self-assess and supervisors and teachers could discuss them in terms of whether indicators were observed or not (See Appendix C). Some talk about its effectiveness with students who need a push, others talk of its effectiveness with the perfectionist who needs to be shown that he should slow down and not be so hard on himself. The complete listing is found in Appendix D.

Discussion and Implications

We wish to emphasize that when this project began in the field with teachers, they were unaware of the outcomes-based standards the State of Texas would eventually turn into the Learner-centered Proficiencies. We believe the subsequent overlap and relationship between the teacher-generated indicators and the research-based State list helps to validate our indicators for student teachers. If we look back to Strauss and Corbin's (1990, p. 23) notion of grounded theory, we see a good fit and a definite increase in understanding on the part of our supervisors and cooperating teachers. We also see it applicable to a great variety of contexts in which our students do their student teaching. Finally, we can say that from the many comments we have had from teachers and supervisors, an increased level of control with the phenomenon of student teaching is felt.

Perhaps most important is the effect these indicators have had with our student teachers. Since it is much clearer to supervisors and teachers that student teaching is a developmental process--with specific indicators helping to guide the novice along the path towards expertise, the student teachers are able to check for progress, target indicators that appear powerful and work on those. No one expects all student teachers to enter the semester at the same point. Some are well into the Growth and Development Phase within the first week. The goal for all student teachers is to check for growth towards the goal of refinement. Thus, the Indicators encourage reflection every step along the way.

Limitations and Future Directions

We recognize that what came from our field study of student teacher progressive indicators and its subsequent matching with State proficiencies might leave some questioning its completeness. After all this is one state in the southwest and one group of teachers in that state. We recognize that other national reform efforts might teach us to look beyond our borders and to look at other indicators. While we find our indicators extremely helpful, we are aware of certain areas that might need to be added or at least discussed in the near future. For example, the following indicators which appeared among 16 items did not emerge from our field study nor explicitly from our Texas proficiencies, yet seem to us very important for teachers and, at least to some degree, student teacher proficiency: These were found in a widely dispersed reform document (Presidential Task Force on Psychology in Education and the American Psychological Association, 1993):

- teacher attitudes and motivation on learning and teaching affect student motivation and learning;
- teachers need information about general and domain-specific metacognitive strategies and how they can be taught to students of different background and abilities;
- teachers need to be encouraged to "think aloud"--to make problem solving explicit and

transparent:

- teachers need knowledge of stress management for themselves and their students;
- teachers need knowledge of selecting best curricula that provides the right cognitive complexity and authenticity for different levels and abilities;
- teachers need knowledge of explicit strategies for dealing with students whose cultures impose differences in public displays of volunteering, asking and answering questions, discussing personal issues, asking for help etc.;
- teachers need explicit pedagogical content knowledge which may be specific and unique to a discipline and performance assessments also specific to a discipline.

We can see ahead of us not only opportunities to add to and refine the Indicators, but to do research on specific effects use of the Indicators has with student teachers. This is a potentially rich field for future research.

Learning to become a teacher is a complex task with many components. We think both mentors and student teachers have in this document a sensible, usable set of indicators which clarifies the task of moving along the continuum from preservice student to first-year teacher. The document accomplishes this without reducing teaching to a set of simple technique-driven skills, preserving both its art and its science. These indicators represent what we might think of as baseline data from the "field." It does reflect what the "field" values--and, perhaps, what the "field" yet lacks. We are well aware that our "Progressive Indicators" merely help begin the trip along the teaching continuum to expert teaching. One need only look at the prototype of expert teaching presented by Sternberg and Horvath (1995)--with its emphasis on quantity and organization of the expert's knowledge, his/her efficiency and insight--to know that the work must continue to help all teachers move towards expert status--be they novice or veteran.

References

- Berliner, D. (1985) . Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (6), 2-8.
- Evertson, C., Hawley, W., Zlotnik, M. (1985) . Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (3), 2-12.
- Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. (1990) . Student teaching and school experiences. In W. Houston (Ed.) , Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan.
- Lanier, J. & Little, J. (1986) . Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. New York: Macmillan.
- Lipton, A., & Lesser, E. (1978) . Teacher training at Stony Brook: A model for conflict. Journal of Teacher Education, 29 (6) , 57-60.
- Metcalf, K.K. (1991) . Supervision of student teaching: A review of research. Teacher Educator, 26 (4), 27-42.
- Metcalf, K.K., Hammer, R., Kahlich, P.A., (1995, April) . Alternatives to field-based experiences: The comparative effects of on-campus laboratories. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Presidential Task Force on Psychology in Education and American Psychological Association (1993) . Learner-centered principles: Guidelines for school redesign and reform. Washington, DC: Author.
- Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988) . Barriers to effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (2), 28-34.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Horvath, J.A. (1995) . A prototype view of expert teaching. Educational Researcher, 24 (6), 9-17.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990) . Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park: Sage.

Texas Consortium of State Organizations for Teacher Education (November 20, 1992) . Outcomes-based standards for teachers. Austin, TX: Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Texas Education Agency (October, 1995) . Learner-centered schools for Texas: A vision for Texas educators. (No. GE6 710 01). Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency (January 29, 1997) . Professional development and appraisal system, initial proof. Austin, TX: Author.

Winograd, K., Higgins, K., McEwan, B., & Haddon, L. (1995, April) . Relinquishing field supervision to the mentors: University teacher educators rethink their practice. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, . San Francisco, CA.

TEXAS TEACHER PROFICIENCIES

Adopted by the State Board of Education in February, 1994. These proficiencies guide preservice preparation, professional development, and teacher appraisal practices for teachers in Texas.

I. LEARNER-CENTERED KNOWLEDGE

The teacher possesses and draws on a rich knowledge base of content, pedagogy and technology to provide relevant and meaningful learning experiences for all students.

The teacher exhibits a strong working knowledge of subject matter and enables students to better understand patterns of thinking specific to a discipline. The teacher stays abreast of current knowledge and practice within the content areas, related disciplines and technology; participates in professional developmental activities; and collaborates with other professionals. Moreover, the teacher contributes to the knowledge base and understands the pedagogy of the discipline.

As the teacher guides learners to construct knowledge through experiences, they learn about relationships among and within the central themes of various disciplines while also learning how to learn. Recognizing the dynamic nature of knowledge, the teacher selects and organizes topics so students make clear connections between what is taught in the classroom and what they experience outside the classroom. As students probe these relationships, the teacher encourages discussion in which both the teacher's and the students' opinions are valued. To further develop multiple perspectives, the teacher integrates other disciplines, learners' interests, and technological resources so that learners consider the central themes of the subject matter from as many different cultural and intellectual viewpoints as possible.

II. LEARNER-CENTERED INSTRUCTION

To create a learner-centered community, the teacher collaboratively identifies needs and plans, implements, and assesses instruction using technology and other resources.

The teacher is a leader of a learner-centered community, in which an atmosphere of trust and openness produces a stimulating exchange of ideas and mutual respect. The teacher is a critical thinker and problem solver who plays a variety of roles when teaching. As a coach, the teacher observes, evaluates, and changes directions and strategies whenever necessary. As a facilitator, the teacher helps students link ideas in the content area to familiar ideas, to prior experiences, and to relevant problems. As a manager, the teacher effectively manages the learning environment so that optimal learning occurs.

Assessment is used to guide the learner community. By using assessment as an integral part of instruction, the teacher responds to the needs of all learners. In addition, the teacher guides learners to develop personally meaningful forms of self assessment.

The teacher selects materials, technology, activities, and space that are developmentally appropriate and designed to engage interest in learning. As a result, learners work independently and cooperatively in a positive and stimulating learning climate fueled by self discipline and motivation.

Although the teacher has a vision for the destination of learning, students set individual goals and plan how to reach the destination. As a result, they take responsibility for their own learning, develop a sense of the importance of learning for understanding, and begin to understand themselves as learners. The teacher's plans integrate learning experiences and various forms of assessment that take into consideration the unique characteristics of the learner community. The teacher shares responsibility for the result of this process with all members of the learning community.

Together, learners and teachers take risks in trying out innovative ideas for learning. To facilitate learning, the teacher encourages various types of learners to shape their own learning through active engagement, manipulation, and examination of ideas and materials. Critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving spark further learning. Consequently, there is an appreciation of learning as a life-long process that builds a greater understanding of the world and a feeling of responsibility toward it.

III. EQUITY IN EXCELLENCE FOR ALL LEARNERS

The teacher responds appropriately to diverse groups of learners.

The teacher not only respects and is sensitive to all learners but also encourages the use of all their skills and talents. As the facilitator of learning, the teacher models and encourages appreciation for students' cultural heritage, unique endowments, learning styles, interest, and needs. The teacher also designs learning experiences that show consideration for these student characteristics.

Because the teacher views differences as opportunities for learning, cross-cultural experiences are an integral part of the learner-centered community. In addition, the teacher establishes a relationship between the curriculum and community cultures. While making this connection, the teacher and students explore attitudes that foster unity. As a result, the teacher creates an environment in which learners work cooperatively and purposefully using a variety of resources to understand themselves, their immediate community, and the global society in which they live.

IV. LEARNER-CENTERED COMMUNICATION

While acting as an advocate for all students and the school, the teacher demonstrates effective professional and interpersonal communication skills.

As a leader, the teacher communicates the mission of the school with learners, professionals, families, and community members. With colleagues, the teacher works to create an environment in which taking risks, sharing new ideas, and innovative problem solving are supported and encouraged. With citizens, the teacher works to establish strong and positive ties between the school and the community.

Because the teacher is a compelling communicator, students begin to appreciate the importance of expressing their views clearly. The teacher uses verbal, nonverbal, and media techniques so that students explore ideas collaboratively, pose questions, and support one another in their learning. The teacher and students listen, speak, read, and write in a variety of contexts; give multimedia and artistic presentations; and use technology as a resource for building communication skills. The teacher incorporates techniques of inquiry that enable students to use different levels of thinking.

The teacher also communicates effectively as an advocate for each learner. The teacher is sensitive to concerns that affect learners and takes advantage of community strengths and resources for the learners' welfare.

V. LEARNER-CENTERED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The teacher, as a reflective practitioner dedicated to all students' success, demonstrates a commitment to learn, to improve the profession and to maintain professional ethics and personal integrity.

As a learner, the teacher works within a framework of clearly defined professional goals to plan for and profit from a wide variety of relevant learning opportunities. The teacher develops an identity as a professional, interacts effectively with colleagues, and takes a role in setting standards for teacher accountability. In addition, the teacher uses technological and other resources to facilitate continual professional growth.

To strengthen the effectiveness and quality of teaching, the teacher actively engages in an exchange of ideas with colleagues, observes peers, and encourages feedback from learners to establish a successful learning community. As a member of a collaborative team, the teacher identifies and uses group processes to make decisions and solve problems.

The teacher exhibits the highest standard of professionalism and bases daily decisions on ethical principles. To support the needs of learners, the teacher knows and uses community resources, school services, and laws relating to teacher responsibilities and student rights. Through these activities, the teacher contributes to the improvement of comprehensive education programs as well as programs within specific disciplines.

Prepared by Mary Jane Vance and provided by Texas A&M University, as information for preservice and inservice teachers.

Suggested Indicators of Student Teacher Progressive Development*

INITIAL STAGE

PROFESSIONALISM

- V • Understands Student Teaching Handbook
- V • Follows school procedures (arrival & departure)
- V • Meets assigned responsibilities promptly and effectively
- III, IV • Shows a friendly personality, sense of humor, warm and accepting attitude (politeness)
- IV • Demonstrates initiative, tactfulness, and good judgment
- V • Displays a professional appearance and attitude
- V • Accepts constructive criticism with a desire to improve
- V • Exhibits flexibility with change
- V • Attends professional meetings

INSTRUCTION

- IV • Uses effective communication skills: vocabulary, verbal habits, handwriting, and grammar
- IV • Displays a pleasing voice level, appropriate speed, and varied intonations (voice variations allow for emphasis of important points)
- IV • Maintains eye contact and appropriate body language
- I • Is knowledgeable of subject matter
- I, II • Possesses enthusiasm for the content as well as the students
- II • Organizes: notebook, lesson plans, instructional materials (everything ready in advance)
- II • Demonstrates awareness of lesson components and thoroughly plans daily lessons

MANAGEMENT

- II, III, IV • Knows students' names and classroom routines
- II, III, IV • Begins moving around the room while teaching
- II, III, IV • Is aware of basic rules and consequences for classroom management and of the need to be consistent in enforcing them
- II, III, IV • Establishes a non-threatening learning environment

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT STAGE

MANAGEMENT

- II, III, IV • Balances fairness and firmness in discipline
- II, III, IV • Uses assertive, calm tone when necessary (telling tone vs. asking tone)
- II, III, IV • Balances verbal and non verbal attendance to discipline in order to bring students back in focus (signals, touches, body language, proximity, praise, clear directives, etc.)
- II, III, IV • Follows through consistently with positive reward system and assertive discipline procedures
- II, III, IV • Scans the room to encourage appropriate behaviors and to redirect off-task behaviors
- II, III, IV • Uses varied and descriptive praise
- II, III, IV • Makes students responsible for their actions (What are you doing? What are you supposed to be doing? What are you going to do about it?)
- II, III, IV • Manages oral question/answer sessions eliminating "blurring out"
- II, III, IV • Is aware of all students (non volunteers, students off-task, student attention spans, etc.)
- II, III, IV • Moves and monitors class throughout teaching time (notes student errors for reteaching purposes, possesses global awareness of class, etc.)
- II, III, IV • Anticipates problems and attends to them before they occur (proactive)

INSTRUCTION

- II, IV • States purpose and relates it to lesson objective(s)
- II, III, IV • Involves all students in discussions
- II, IV • Uses effective questioning techniques to check for understanding and extend students' responses
- II, IV • Uses appropriate wait time and prompting during questioning to insure student success
- II • Demonstrates effective modeling techniques
- IV • Provides step-by-step directions for clear understanding of expectations
- I, II, III • Allows sufficient practice time to insure concept understanding
- I, II, III, IV • Relates content to real life situations
- II, IV • Maintains a smooth lesson pace eliminating "dead" time
- II • Demonstrates transitional techniques both within and between lessons
- I, II, III, IV • Relates lesson to prior and future learning
- I, II, III, IV • Provides for a consistent motivation and student-centered closure
- I, II, III, IV • Incorporates a variety of teaching strategies (visual/kinesthetic) and activities in lesson
- I, II • Uses visual aides whenever possible
- I, II • Uses available technology
- II • Distinguishes between lesson planning and unit formation

PROFESSIONALISM

- II, V • Begins to take more initiative in long-term planning and shows confidence in making instructional decisions
- II, V • Demonstrates effective time management for all teaching responsibilities
- II, IV, V • Handles stress in a professional manner
- II, IV, V • Uses reflective thinking to successfully analyze instruction (videotaping, journal writing, etc.)

REFINEMENT STAGE

MANAGEMENT

- By this stage, student teachers should be confident in their ability to manage most student behaviors so that refinement of instructional skills can take place.

INSTRUCTION

- I, II, III, IV • Elicits students' ideas to develop lesson objectives
- I, II, III, IV • Motivates consistently to insure students' active engagement in learning as a pleasurable experience
- I, II, III, IV • Summarizes and provides adequate student-centered closures
- I, II, III, IV • Develops an atmosphere of anticipation for future learning
- I, II, III, IV • Demonstrates effective lesson sequencing/pacing by knowing what students can handle in allotted time period
- I, II • Integrates subject matter across several disciplines (if applicable)
- II • Raises and lowers students' levels of concern appropriately
- I, II, III, IV • Plans for special needs (modification, reteach, extension)
- I, II, III, IV • Takes advantage of teachable moments
- I, II, IV • Evidences consistent higher-level questioning to produce critical thinking

PROFESSIONALISM

- I, II, III, IV • Is aware of total teaching environment and meets responsibilities successfully
- I, II, III, IV, V • Transfers effectively from the role of student to the role of teacher

* These indicators were compiled by Diane Graham, Texas A&M University supervisor, in consultation with Texas A&M University supervisors and College Station ISD teachers. Each indicator has been keyed by Cathy Loving, Director of Field Experiences with Roman Numerals to the Texas Teacher Proficiencies (see preceding pages).

Student Teacher Progressive Development Initial Stage Observation Checklist

Student Teacher _____ Cooperating Teacher _____ Supervisor _____

Category	Indicators	Observed	Not Observed	Comments
PROFESSIONALISM	Understands Student Handbook			
	Follows school procedures (arrival & departure)			
	Meets assigned responsibilities promptly & effectively			
	Shows friendly personality, sense of humor, warm & accepting attitude			
	Demonstrates initiative, tactfulness, and good judgement			
	Displays a professional appearance and attitude			
	Accepts constructive criticism with a desire to improve			
	Exhibits flexibility with change			
	Attends professional meetings			
INSTRUCTION	Uses effective communication skills: vocabulary, verbal habits, handwriting and grammar			
	Displays a pleasing voice level, appropriate speed, and varied intonations (voice variations allow for emphasis of important points)			
	Maintains eye contact and appropriate body language			
	Is knowledgeable of subject matter			
	Possesses enthusiasm for the content as well as the student			
	Organizes: notebook, lesson plans, instructional materials (in advance)			
	Demonstrates awareness of lesson components and thoroughly plans daily lessons			
MANAGEMENT	Knows students' names and classroom routines			
	Begins moving around the room while teaching			
	Is aware of basic rules and consequences for classroom management and of the need to be consistent in enforcing them			
	Establishes a non-threatening learning environment			

Date _____

Student Teacher Progressive Development Growth & Development Stage Observation Checklist

Student Teacher _____ Cooperating Teacher _____ Supervisor _____

Category	Indicators	Observed	Not Observed	Comments
PROFESSIONALISM	Begins to take initiative in long-term planning and shows confidence in making instructional decisions			
	Demonstrates effective time management for all teaching responsibilities			
	Handles stress in a professional manner			
	Uses reflective thinking to successfully analyze instruction			
INSTRUCTION	States purpose and relates it to lesson objective(s)			
	Involves all student in discussions			
	Uses effective questioning techniques to check for understanding and extend students' responses			
	Uses appropriate wait time and prompting during questioning to insure student success			
	Demonstrates effective modeling techniques			
	Provides step-by-step directions for clear understanding of expectations			
	Allows sufficient practice time to insure concept understanding			
	Relates content to real life situations			
	Maintains a smooth lesson pace eliminating "dead" time			
	Demonstrates transitional techniques both within and between lessons			
	Relates lesson to prior and future learning			
	Provides for a consistent motivation and student-centered closure			
	Incorporates a variety of teaching strategies (visual/kinesthetic) and activities in lesson			
	Uses visual aides whenever possible			
	Uses available technology			
	Distinguishes between lesson planning and unit formation			

Date _____

Page 1

Student Teacher Progressive Development Growth & Development Stage Observation Checklist (Continued)

Student Teacher _____ Cooperating Teacher _____ Supervisor _____

Rating Scale 1 = Exceptional & Consistent 2 = High Quality 3 = Satisfactory w/Anticipated Growth 4 = Marginal 5 = Unsatisfactory

Category	Proficiencies	Rating	Comments
MANAGEMENT	Balances fairness and firmness in discipline		
	Uses assertive, calm tone when necessary (telling tone vs. asking tone)		
	Balances verbal and nonverbal attendance to discipline in order to bring students back in focus (signals, touches, body language, proximity, praise, clear directives, etc.)		
	Follows through consistently with positive reward system and assertive discipline procedures		
	Scans the room to encourage appropriate behaviors and to redirect off-task behaviors		
	Uses varied and descriptive praise		
	Makes students responsible for their actions (What are you doing? What are you supposed to be doing? What are you going to do about it?)		
	Makes behavior expectations clear prior to beginning of lesson and before all activities		
	Manages oral question/answer sessions eliminating "blurring out"		
	Is aware of all students (nonvolunteers, students off-task, student attention spans, etc.)		
	Moves and monitors class throughout teaching time (notes student errors for reteaching purposes, possesses global awareness of class, etc.)		
	Anticipates problems and attends to them before they occur (proactive)		

Additional Comments:

25

26

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Date _____

Student Teacher Progressive Development Refinement Stage Observation Checklist

Student Teacher _____ Cooperating Teacher _____ Supervisor _____

Category	Indicators	Observed	Not Observed	Comments
PROFESSIONALISM	Is aware of total teaching environment and meets responsibilities successfully			
	Transfers effectively from the role of student to the role of teacher			
INSTRUCTION	Elicits students' ideas to develop lesson objectives			
	Motivates consistently to insure students' active engagement in learning as a pleasurable experience			
	Summarizes and provides adequate student-centered closures			
	Develops an atmosphere of anticipation for future learning			
	Demonstrates effective lesson sequencing/pacing by knowing what students can handle in allotted time period			
	Integrates subject matter across several disciplines (if applicable)			
	Raises and lowers students' levels of concern appropriately			
	Plans for special needs (modification, reteach, extension)			
	Takes advantage of teachable moments			
	Evidences consistent higher-level questioning to produce critical thinking			

Additional Comments:

27

28

Date _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Categories for use of indicators:

1. Helps Cooperating Teachers know what to concentrate on right away
2. Use with student teachers as growth and development process; what to anticipate, use again at mid-point (several use it as a tool at mid-point)
3. Use as motivator to student teacher not on track
4. Use to reassure a perfectionist that becoming an expert teacher is a developmental process and all can't fall into place immediately
5. Use in writing formative evaluation-helps them write a more precise and helpful document with specificity that recognizes the developmental process
6. Helps student teachers be realistic about their expectations by helping to categorize and prioritize critical things in teaching
7. Personality plays a part in how student teachers respond to these. Many supervisors do not go over these all at once as it could be overwhelming
8. Highlights what is really important and encourages them to develop a management plan early--even if they have to adopt their cooperating teachers'--because of what is coming in the growth and development stage--plenty of management indicators
9. Purpose is primarily not to use as an evaluation instrument per se. We try to avoid numbers and other absolute judgments. This instrument is primarily designed to improve the progress towards successful teaching for a novice